

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
DECEMBER 13, 2002, IN THE ALUMNI HOUSE**

- Present:** President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, Parliamentarian Pagel; Dean Frawley; Professors Balla, Castleberry, Duff, Friedenthal, Gallo, Glascock, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Kennedy, Klarén, Maggs, Paratore, Robinson, Simon, West, Wilmarth, and Wirtz
- Absent:** Deans Futrell, Harding, Phillips, Southby, Tong, Williams, Whitaker, and Young; Professors Briscoe, Cawley, Cordes, Divita, Haque, Pelzman, Sell, and Zaghloul

The meeting was called to order by Vice President Lehman at 2:18 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Professor Robinson advised the Senate that the minutes of the November 8th meeting were not yet ready for distribution, and approval of the November minutes was deferred until the next Senate meeting.

UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY'S ADVANCEMENT EFFORTS

Ms. Beverly Bond, Vice President for Advancement, briefed the Senate on the work of her division after wishing Vice President Lehman a happy birthday. Vice President Lehman acknowledged her good wishes, and noted that December 13th was also Vice President Bond's birthday.

The Advancement division was formerly called Development, Vice President Bond said, but the name has been changed to Advancement because this connotes a holistic approach to working in mutually beneficial relationships with the University's distinct constituencies. The mission of the Advancement division still includes alumni programs, formerly alumni relations. And it certainly includes development, or fundraising.

The first mission under the Advancement umbrella is the collection of data, which consists of constantly updating and knowing everything possible about the GW constituencies. This is not unlike any basic business plan, she added, where a market assessment is undertaken. GW's "market" includes its alumni, its employees, its parents, and its vendors, all entities interested in areas in which the University specializes. The collection of current data enables the University to be more efficient and to use its resources in the best possible fashion to achieve the number one objective of the division, which is to foster the generation of philanthropy, in dollars, for the University.

Vice President Bond stressed that another related, and in some ways symbiotic, objective was involving and engaging the University's constituencies in ways that are mutually beneficial to both. She said she has been struck by the quality of GW's constituencies, however, there are many who have not even been researched or located. Recent research has revealed a number of individuals who are extremely wealthy, or extremely successful in their fields, and this is the sort of information which should be driving the University's Advancement efforts.

There are components in maximizing the University's relationship to its constituencies. The first is maintaining information, who people are, what they do, what their interests are, and that is a moving target. Audiences change, and even though "an alum is an alum" until he or she dies, they move, their interests change, they have children, and they change jobs. The whole area of data is critically important to the Advancement division both in terms of information gathering, and as a tool to further the University's advancement mission. In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data is also important in establishing a state-of-the-art central database that is not merely an information repository, but a working and management tool that the University can use. Vice President Bond added that her division hopes to be able to work with as many as 8,000 prospective donors once the database is in place, and she encouraged faculty to share with her division any information that they might have about potential prospects.

The second component under the Advancement umbrella is designing the division's plans according to what is known about the target market. A third component is engaging key constituents in ways that relate to GW's priorities, and highlighting things that are special about the University. Engaging these people in substantive ways can include linking up a key researcher with another key researcher in the same field, to strengthen the fabric that is the GW community both inside and outside Washington, D.C.

Vice President Bond continued by describing the fourth component of the division's program, which is to be guided by a mindset of investment, rather than seeking handouts. It is best in the long run, she said, to think about each relationship the University has with its constituent groups as one which will lead the University towards continuing investment in the good of the GW community. This will also enable the University to maximize its return on the investment made in Advancement efforts.

Vice President Bond then said that she had recently had lunch with Professor Griffith, a Senate member, and Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. In response to Professor Griffith's inquiries about new initiatives by the Advancement division, Vice President Bond said that the division has added some research capability and that effort has proven very productive. Probably another thousand individuals have recently been added to existing lists of people who can prospectively contribute to GW. The division has also just developed a parent's program, staffed by four professionals, and the division has found that the parent group is comprised, for the most part, of a very excited and happy population, many of whom have been accustomed to being involved in their son or daughter's school at the high school, and an even earlier level.

Another area that the division seeks to strengthen is called creative services. This includes a marketing function and a proposal-writing function. In the marketing function, the division seeks to refine its efforts to make programs more oriented to its audience so that it is not approaching its targets in segments. People who are interested in planned giving, for example, will be, hopefully, enticed to do that. In order to strengthen the information gathering function, the division has added a web manager, and improvements can already be seen to the Advancement website. In addition to the possible development of chat rooms for alumni, the division is looking at the possibility of making virtual campus tours readily available. As far as proposal writing is concerned, Vice President Bond said that crafting an Advancement proposal is a very different enterprise than writing government grant proposals, or other solicitations. A new person has been hired in the division with a good deal of background in developing cases in the higher education arena and proposals are increasingly trying to articulate exactly why GW needs money: for people, for scholarships, graduate fellowships, research enterprises, or faculty chairs, to name a few. The arguments increasingly need to be fine-tuned, precise, and convey a sense of urgency that is genuine, which informs the prospective donor why funding is needed now. The arguments must be made quickly, and powerfully.

Yet another area of critical importance to the Advancement division is the notion of Stewardship. GW needs a very well organized routine for reporting to donors on how gifts to the University are being used. It is difficult to gather all of this information together in an institution as decentralized as GW, but the effort to do this has begun, and faculty assistance in this area would be welcome.

Two staff members have been added to the division's corporation and foundation office, where there was only one staff member before. That area is now fully staffed, and that office should be able to capitalize on the many opportunities available that it could not take advantage of before.

In terms of specific results, Vice President Bond reported that the University is ahead of schedule on the Centuries Campaign, and that the target was to break the \$500 million mark. The University has exceeded that goal already, and by the end of June the total should be substantially higher than the original goal. In terms of year-to-year dollars raised, this past fiscal year was the largest ever for GW in private support [excluding any government support or contract] and over \$48.4 million was received. This marks the third year in GW history, she added, in which more than \$40 million has been received. This total compares very favorably with gift totals received over the past 10 years, at the end of which range totals were approximately \$24 million [per year], to \$26 million [per year] five years ago.

In terms of data collection, Vice President Bond said in the last six months of the past fiscal year, something like 982 new prospective donors were discovered and assigned to staff to manage. Two demographic screenings of the alumni population and parent population have been conducted. In the first six months of 2002, some 24,000 new e-mail addresses have been collected. The University has over 200,000 alumni, and that number is growing, she added.

In order to strengthen work already underway with the current student population, an e-mail forwarding-for-life program has been put into place, which will enable the University to keep in touch with former students.

In conclusion, Vice President Bond again highlighted areas in which faculty can be of assistance, particularly in enhancing stewardship efforts and in helping to develop information for the centralized database. It is important to remember, she said, that Advancement is in some ways more an endless marathon than a concrete capital campaign which is limited in scope. It is important to involve the very best people in the University's Advancement programs, as partners in advancing advancement, to showcase the accomplishments of GW graduates, and to stay the course, and without being distracted by gimmicks. [President Trachtenberg assumed the Chair at this point in the meeting.]

Professor Griffith advised the Senate that the reason he had invited Vice President Bond to lunch was because he had noticed that this year there had been a significant increase in the Advancement budget, and as Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, he wanted to know how these increased funds were being put to use. A whole lot more has been done, he said, in terms of strengthening the University's efforts to align the University's information base with potential donors, and this sort of project is very expensive. It seems the University has committed significant resources to the effort, he added, and the payoff for the University should be substantial.

One area which Professor Griffith said he thought needed improvement was in the area of reports to departments when a gift is received by the University, earmarked for a particular department. Sometimes departments receive information about these gifts, he added, and sometimes they do not, which may create the perception that gifts are being ignored. It is important, he said, for departments to have this information so that they can write to thank donors for their generosity, and he said he hoped this would be something the Advancement division could work on.

REPORT OF THE REGISTRAR ON THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA)

Dennis L. Geyer, University Registrar, thanked the Senate for the opportunity to bring it up to date on FERPA, and he distributed a copy of the FERPA statement that was e-mailed to everyone in November. Last year, he said, was the first time that the University attempted to do an annual statement of this sort to inform faculty, staff, and administrative employees of their responsibilities under the Act. Put together in cooperation with Linda Schutjer of the University's General Counsel's office, the statement gives a history of the Act. The Registrar's Office also worked with interpretations issued by the Family Compliance Office of the Department of Education and various court interpretations from Federal Courts and the U.S. Supreme Court.

The University's purpose in issuing the statement, he continued, is to ensure that students not only have access to their education records, but to maintain confidentiality as well.

An education record is defined, he said, as anything that contains information that deals directly with a student, and is maintained by the University or an educational agency. There are a few exceptions, he added, listed on page 3 of the statement – primarily medical records (such as those held at the Health Service), law enforcement records (such as University Police Department documents), and other professional records, as well as employment records. However, he added, student employment records are covered by FERPA because students have obtained such employment by virtue of their student status; i.e. graduate students, teaching assistants, and those on Work Study.

The FERPA statement gives guidelines for the release of student information, he continued. Upon presentation of various forms of identification, the University is then obligated, within 45 days, to provide to a student requested information contained in education records held by the institution. This is a bit difficult at GW, he said, because many of the institution's records are decentralized in Dean's offices and Schools, as well as in departments, or in major adviser's offices – in addition to those electronic records maintained by the Registrar's Office.

It is important to note, he said, that students are not entitled to see certain information maintained by the University, such as financial records of parents, as well as letters of recommendation where the student has signed a waiver. Where students have not waived their right to see written recommendations, they are allowed access to the information.

One form of information the University is permitted to share with the general public concerning students is directory information, clearly defined in the FERPA statement. However, he said, a student can request and obtain confidentiality so that this information is not released without a written waiver from the student concerned. Overall, he said, the release of education records can be complicated at times, for there are other laws that supercede FERPA, among them the Solomon Act and the recent USA Patriot Act.

The consequences of the improper release of protected student information, he continued, can range from minor sanctions to personnel action against a staff member, as well as potential litigation against both the University and the individual releasing the information.

Information concerning FERPA is made available in many ways to students, as it is published in the Schedule of Classes, in various bulletins, and in publications coming out of the Parent Services Office and the Dean of Students Office. FERPA information is also available on the Registrar's website, as well as on the GW Bulletin and faculty websites.

One of the particularly sensitive issues in dealing with information under FERPA, he said, is parent access to student records. Parental status alone is not enough, he said, to guarantee access to their student's records. The University has two ways of helping parents

gain access, one of which is encouraging them to talk to their student and request permission to access records covered by the Act. The other is written consent and/or a statement of financial dependency filed by parents each calendar year which certifies that a particular student is claimed on the parent's federal tax return as a dependent. With either of these documents in hand, staff can share information.

In conclusion, Registrar Geyer said that there has been some recent concern about posting grades by student name and/or Social Security number. Both of these practices, he said, are violations of FERPA, particularly in the latter instance because a student's Social Security number is not considered directory information – even though it is identical to the student identification number utilized by the University. An effort is underway to reiterate to faculty information about FERPA so that violations will not occur, and so that the University can continue to be a good steward of information entrusted to it. The Registrar then invited questions about his presentation.

Professor Kennedy asked if it were not permissible to use the last four digits of a student identification or Social Security number, and the Registrar said it has been acceptable practice to use the last four or five digits of this number.

Professor Griffith observed that the USA Patriot Act gives considerable legal leeway to federal authorities to potentially track students, particularly foreign students, and he asked if the faculty has any new responsibilities, or changed responsibilities because of this Act. The Registrar responded that when federal agents make inquiries at his office, they are required, before being given access to non-directory information, to prove that the information they are requesting is part of a formal, ongoing investigation. They cannot require that the Registrar release a list of every student from a particular country, within certain birthdates, for example. The Registrar's office also works closely with the University's General Counsel's Office when faced with requests of this nature, as it also does when information needs to be released for health and safety reasons as verified through the University Police Department, or the General Counsel's Office.

Professor Gupta asked whether or not faculty should respond to security and background checks by, typically, federal personnel. The Registrar responded that, generally, such personnel will have with them a release form signed by the student and that under these circumstances, faculty could disclose information to the agent. However, he said, should an agent lack such written permission, faculty members should refer these agents immediately to the Registrar or to the General Counsel's Office. The President added that he thought faculty should also feel free to respond to such requests by saying that they wished to consult with the General Counsel's Office before responding to an information request, if for any reason they were uncomfortable with it.

Professor Kennedy then said that he had tried on several occasions to send letters to alumni, but had always been denied their address by the Alumni Office. The Registrar responded by saying that alumni information is not covered by FERPA, and that faculty members could request the last known student address if it was not held confidential within the student system. The President added that Vice President Bond could also obtain such

information upon request, and that her office presently has something like 25% of alumni e-mail addresses.

Professor Glascock related that he had tried to contact a former student whose name he saw featured in the alumni publication of another university. When he contacted that university for address information, that university responded, not with the former student's address, but with an offer to contact the alumnus giving him Professor Glascock's address, and inform him that Professor Glascock wished to correspond with him. Vice President Bond reminded the Senate that her office is in the process of developing an online directory which would allow alumni with a password to access directory information.

Professor Friedenthal asked to what extent FERPA covers student information, particularly disciplinary information, after they have left the University. The Registrar confirmed that FERPA guarantees of confidentiality for student records are still in force once a student has left, or graduated from, the University. Disciplinary records are not directory information, he confirmed, and this information is not shared absent a written release.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson also wished both Vice Presidents a happy birthday, and extended those wishes to the President, whose birthday was the following day. She then presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed. President Trachtenberg thanked Professor Robinson for the birthday greetings.

II. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Griffith, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, distributed copies of his Committee's Interim Report, and touched briefly on two important points. In preparing a report to the Senate on the Fiscal Year '03 Five-Year Operating and Capital budgets, the Committee learned that the University and the Board of Trustees at its October meeting had decided to reduce the drawdown from the endowment, which is used to support the operating budget. As the Senate might know, he added, the University has a long-established policy of drawing down approximately 5.5% over a rolling three year average of the endowment. In recent years, there has been some significant supplemental payout from the endowment to support things like renovation of classrooms and the technology initiative. As of last May, he said, the University had already cut the drawdown

from the endowment by some \$2 million, and now, in October, the decision was made to cut the drawdown by another \$3 million.

Professor Griffith also added a statement to the Committee's report which provides that in FY '04, the endowment drawdown is scheduled to fall by another \$7.3 million, entirely eliminating the supplemental payouts, and cutting the overall payment rate by 1%. Thus, the draw from the endowment would be lowered from 7% to 6%.

Fiscal Planning and Budgeting is also examining the University's budget model, as there is a lot of concern about the unified budget, which ties activities off-campus to on-campus programs. This clearly has an impact on financial incentives that are built into various kinds of research programs, he added, and into various kinds of off-campus programs as well.

Lastly, Professor Griffith highlighted the reduced value of the University's endowment, which at its peak was some \$750 million, and is now worth something like \$600 million, and said this has happened even though a substantial portion of the University's endowment -- something like \$150 million -- is in real estate, and not equity markets. Other major universities, he concluded, have had to make significant budget reductions due to reductions in endowment values. (The Committee's Report is attached.)

Professor Gupta, Chair of the Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management Committee, distributed an Interim Report. This report, he said, gives a snapshot of what is happening in undergraduate and graduate admissions, and about trends in undergraduate financial aid. Professor Griffith asked a question concerning need-based financial aid, and Professor Gupta pointed out that some of the financial aid students receive, even that which is need-based, could be loans. Professor Kennedy asked if anyone knew what percentage of aid is a loan, and Professor Gupta said that he had that information in his office, and would be happy to share it. Professor Gallo asked about the 92% retention rate during students' first and second years, and asked if that represented any change from historic numbers. Vice President Lehman said that over the last three years, the rate has been approximately 92%. (The Committee's Report is attached.)

Professor Duff, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, submitted an Interim Report. The Committee has primarily been looking at the undergraduate Writing Proposal, which is part of the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. The Committee plans to report on this program early in the spring semester. Another project is work on the Public Affairs Task Force, a joint effort of his Committee and the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committees. Finally, the Committee will continue its work on examining tenure and promotion policies. (The Committee Reports are attached.)

Professor Maggs, Chair of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, submitted an Interim Report. This Committee is looking at three issues. One, which is somewhat controversial, is whether or not there should be a substitute procedure, other than formal removal for cause, for professors who, for perhaps medical or other

reasons, have stopped teaching, but are unable to resign. The second issue is the percentage of tenure and tenure-track faculty in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, and whether or not that the school is in compliance with the Faculty Code in this area. Thirdly, the Committee is examining whether or not the category "Professor of Practice" should be added to the Faculty Code. (The Committee's Report is attached.)

Professor Friedenthal, Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee, made an Interim Report. The Committee has commenced a survey of the arts and sciences departments of [mostly private] market basket and local schools in order to determine the level of support for faculty attending conferences and professional meetings. Of sixteen surveys distributed, fourteen were returned, and the Committee plans to share its results with the schools queried. Survey results should be informative, he added, with regard to whether or not GW's practices in this area are consistent with that of other institutions.

Professor Kennedy, Chair of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, said that his Committee's report would be distributed with the December minutes. He summarized three areas examined this semester, which were medical costs during open enrollment, contract faculty across the board, particularly in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (which appears to be out of compliance with the Faculty Code), and lastly, how endowed professorships (chairs) are awarded in the various schools. (The Committee's Report is attached.)

In the absence of the Committee Chair, Professor Robinson distributed the Interim Report of the Committee on University and Urban Affairs. She also distributed the Interim Report of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, as Professor Paratore, the Chair, had to leave the meeting early. (The Committee Reports are attached.)

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Donald R. Lehman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, briefed the Senate on investments the University has made on behalf of Graduate Teaching Assistants, Graduate Research Assistants, and Graduate Administrative Assistants. He began by saying that a memorandum was recently sent to all deans and department chairs outlining the measures undertaken to improve the compensation of these students, which include making available health benefits and increases in stipend support. For any graduate student who applies, he said, the University will contribute \$250 per semester, to a maximum of \$500 per year, toward the cost of the Student Health Plan. This program was begun two years ago. Some 76 students, out of 400 eligible, have elected to participate in this plan.

Graduate student support is also an important element of the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, he continued, and the University's objective is to bring graduate student stipends up to a minimum of \$15,000 per student in packages awarded, which include a stipend plus tuition hours. This program was begun last spring with a University investment of \$250,000. That amount was doubled in Fall, 2002, another \$250,000 will be

added in January, and that same amount will be added in Fall, 2003. Thus, he said, as of next fall, the University will have invested a total of \$1 million toward reaching the goal of providing a \$15,000 stipend per student package. Additional increments are planned for Fiscal Year '03-'04, which will bring the total to \$1.5 million. Because the cost of living and tuition go up each year, and because the University must remain competitive with other universities in the size of these packages, GW will have to plan for the minimum package to increase each year, but the University is now at parity with schools such as New York and Columbia Universities in regard to the minimum.

Finally, looking at the outer years, Vice President Lehman said that a goal of the Strategic Plan in social sciences and humanities is for the University to be able to guarantee packages for a five year period so that the students who go into those programs would be guaranteed support and, hopefully, complete their programs faster. In addition, since most students in the sciences and mathematics usually can find support from grants and contracts after the second or third year, the University would try to ensure that they are appointed as a GTA or a GRA, and would have support for a minimum of two years, and a maximum of three years. After that, he added, the faculty would have the responsibility to support these students on grants.

President Trachtenberg observed that, with only 76 students signed up for the health benefit, the cost to the University of doubling that support to \$1,000 per student would be relatively modest, and might well do a lot of good. He then added that he thought the University ought to take a serious look at this option.

Registrar Geyer asked that Senate members encourage all faculty to make use of the FacultyWeb in submitting their grades, as it is a lot more efficient than the alternative, with less chance of data entry errors. One faculty member asked when faculty would receive grade sheets, and the Registrar responded that they are in the mail.

President Trachtenberg then said he wished everyone a very happy holiday, and a wonderful New Year, and he added that he didn't know how many present had had a chance to read the November Senate minutes, but that they were the most exciting minutes of the last fifteen years. To the extent that he added perhaps too much excitement to those minutes, he added, he wished to apologize. He then turned to Professor Robinson and assured everyone that he would continue to refer to her as Madam Chairman in future.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and following another exchange of holiday wishes, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded, and President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 3:14 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer
Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary

The George Washington University
Faculty Senate Committee on
Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management
Interim Report

We have held two meetings of this committee in the Fall semester. At our first meeting we reviewed the admissions criteria for undergraduate admissions. Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Dr. Kathy Napper provided valuable information that is summarized below. At our second meeting, we reviewed undergraduate financial aid, and graduate enrollments. Reports were provided by Daniel Small, director of Undergraduate Financial Aid and Kristin Williams, director of Graduate Student Enrollment Management.

In the belief that the following information would be of interest to faculty, highlights of these reports and ensuing discussions are listed below.

Undergraduate Admissions

- This year we had 16,976 applications with 6,826 admits (40% admit rate) and a yield of 34%. We have 2,293 incoming freshman with an overall average SAT of 1260, of these about 36% were admitted through Early Decision (ED). We admitted 1460 students in ED1, ED2 (~ 50% of total). SAT average is about 1200 for Early Decision (ED) and 1300 for Regular Decision. 60% of the entering class come from the top 10% high school class rank; 22% come from the second 10% class rank. We have students from 49 states (none from MS) and many countries. 43% of the entering class is from the mid-Atlantic states; 4% of the class is from overseas.
- Admissions Officers visit about 1000 high schools each year. There are five regional admissions offices. International recruiting visits are carried out in group travel with other universities.
- This year we have given out a lot of scholarships. Even the families earning \$100,000+ are asking for financial aid. 60% of the entering class receives a need based financial aid. There are 225 people in the honors program— all of these receive some sort of aid.
- Our retention rate is about 92% during the first and second year.

Undergraduate Financial Aid

- GW administers about \$120 million worth of financial assistance for all our students. This amount includes Federal, State and GW funds; 2/3 rd of this money comes from GW funds. Total GW budget for 02-03 year is \$74,298,353 of which \$2 million is drawn from the endowments. Note that most of this money is used to support the Fall admits; Spring admits do not get any GW money. Also, there is never any money for summers.
- The average award for the current year is \$14,288 (this excludes athletic grant-in-aid awards which number 194 and average \$19,359 this year.). About 60% of all undergraduates get some kind of financial aid leaving 40% of students who are “self-pay”. A large number of students apply for aid and don’t qualify for need based assistance. Average need based package is about \$20,000 which includes loans and GW money.
- Undergraduate discount rate this year is about 34% which has dropped from the 45% rate of a few years ago.

- As of 9/28/02, we had 1332 Freshmen awards averaging \$15,500 (including merit and need based) and 3716 continuing student awards averaging \$13,834. We had also processed 7881 loans (both undergraduate and graduate) averaging \$10,623.
- Note that as of 7/1/02 GW has become a "School as Lender" and we now lend funds to graduate students. Undergraduate Financial Aid office administers all graduate student loans.

Graduate Enrollments

- Whereas there was a 2% annual increase in graduate enrolments in the 1990s, this trend has now reversed and we are seeing a average of 1% decline per year. This is true for all schools. Off campus numbers are growing (from 1543 to 2636) though Va. Campus fluctuates.
- Graduate admissions data: This year, we had 9968 applications university wide for Masters of which 5592 were admitted (56.1%) and 2832 matriculated (50.6%). For Ph.D. we had 2412 applications of which 657 were admitted (27.2%) and 326 matriculated (49.6%). Domestic numbers are up though international numbers have been declining, due to a variety of reasons including visa delays.
- There is intense competition locally, domestically, and globally. We are moving head to head with the stiffest competition in competing for outstanding students. For example, there are 27 schools in DC area offering a variety of MBA programs. Many universities overseas are also marketing aggressively for the same international students – these include Canada, Australia and even Germany. These universities are emulating U.S. Higher Ed. programs internationally and US share of this market is decreasing. Distance education is everywhere. University of Phoenix has 133,700 students worldwide of whom 49,400 are online; it has its first Ph.D. programs.
- We continue to suffer from post 9/11 hurdles, which includes international students afraid to come here and visa problems. Our high tuition costs continually make us less competitive.
- Opportunities: With the coming "baby boomlet" we should expect a 1% increase in enrolments each year for the next 20 years. In a faltering economy, more people traditionally decide to go to graduate school. Because of 9/11 there is high interest in public service and international affairs. Our location in DC is always an attractive opportunity.
- We have limited funds for recruitment, marketing, and enhancing our graduate programs. The university has this year added \$500,000 to graduate student stipends and another \$500,000 will be added in calendar year 2003. Similar, smaller, additions are planned for 2004 though this increased support would be targeted to the seven programs that have been identified as "selective areas of academic excellence" and certain other programs.

Respectfully Submitted

Marli M. Gupta, Chair

*Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions Policy,
Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management
December 13, 2002*

INTERIM REPORT
OF
APPOINTMENT, SALARY,
AND
PROMOTION POLICIES COMMITTEE
FALL, 2002

The Committee met three times, once in September, once in October, and once in November. It first considered rising health costs, health benefits, and the open enrollment period. At our second meeting we discussed the level (%) of contract faculty in the different schools. Of particular concern was the Graduate School of Education and Human Development which currently has a higher percentage of contract faculty than the Faculty Code allows. A sub-committee is studying the way in which this irregularity can be resolved without interfering with what was generally perceived to be the excellent performance of GSEHD.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has asked the ASPP Committee to investigate how academic chairs (endowed chairs) are appointed at G.W. and at comparable institutions (Emory, Vanderbilt, NYU, Boston University). The Office of Institutional Research in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is looking into this. The deans of the different colleges have been contacted as well. So far we have received very little information. One concern of the Executive Committee is to what extent the procedure varies from school to school and whether faculty are involved in the appointment of chairs.

Next semester the Committee will begin to consider the titles and salary implications of the titles which various part-time faculty members hold. Having dealt with full-time and part-time salaries last year, we are focusing this year on appointments.

R. Emmet Kennedy
Chair
December 12, 2002

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
PROGRESS REPORT
NOVEMBER 9, 2002

The Educational Policy Committee has met three times since the beginning of the academic year.

1. Undergraduate Writing Proposal

Our major task thus far has been to examine the recommendations on undergraduate writing made by the Academic Excellence Committee. We were asked to look at this proposal by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in a memo dated September 13, 2002.

At its first two meetings, the committee spoke about the proposal with Vice President Lehman and with two of the CCAS representatives to the Academic Excellence Committee, Michael King and Linda Levy Peck (the chair of EPC also spoke with Theresa Murphy, another CCAS representative to that committee, by phone). These conversations centered on the process by which the proposal arose. Discussion focused primarily around the following points:

1. The success (or lack thereof) of the current writing program and whether or not relevant evidence had been sought or discovered in this regard.
2. The English Department's involvement (or non-involvement) in the discussions of the Academic Excellence Committee.
3. The expectations of the Academic Excellence Committee concerning the immediate future of the proposal when it left that committee (i.e., did the committee expect their proposal to be ready to go directly to the schools for implementation or did they consider their proposal a first draft to be further considered?).

At its third meeting, the EPC turned its attention to the proposal itself. It will continue its discussions in January. The committee expects to make a report to the Senate on the Academic Excellence Committee's writing proposal in the early spring of 2003).

2. Report on the Task Force on Public Affairs

A subcommittee was formed of the following Senate Committees, Educational Policy, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. Two members of the Educational Policy Committee were appointed to serve on the task force, Steve McGraw and Paul Duff. The subcommittee has met twice. At its second meeting, the subcommittee met with Kathy Newcomer, Joe Cordes and Hal Wolman to discuss their understanding of the need to implement a School of Public Affairs within CCAS. The subcommittee expects to produce a report for the senate in the spring.

3. Tenure and Promotion

The Educational Policy Committee expects to continue its project on tenure and promotion policies in the spring, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul B. Duff
Chair

**Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee
of the Faculty Senate**

Interim Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of Dec. 13, 2002

In three meetings of the Committee this fall term, two major items have been prominent on our agenda:

1. Preparation of a report to the Faculty Senate on the FY03 Five-Year Operating and Capital Budgets. Prof. Packer (BioSci) again heads a subcommittee drafting this report. However, the Committee has just learned that the FY03 Budgets were significantly revised at the October meeting of the Board of Trustees. The earlier version of these budgets had already cut substantially, from \$8.4m to \$6.4m, the draw-down of the endowment in support of the operating budget. These cuts were in supplemental payouts in support of classroom and laboratory renovations, and the technology initiative.

The Committee is now informed that the supplemental payout will be cut further in this fiscal year, by another \$3m. Although there may be some further adjustments to the Operating Budget later on, initially these cuts will be felt in the technology initiative and in a supplement to the Medical Center capital budget. In addition, in FY04, the endowment draw-down is scheduled to drop by another \$7.3m, entirely eliminating the supplemental payouts and lowering the overall payout-rate by 1%, to 6%.

2. The second item currently being focused on is an inquiry into the university's budgeting process. We have already received reports on the "Unified Budget Model" and the "Incentive Funding Programs", and are now looking at the actual decision processes. We are currently reviewing these to see whether the process is an open and fair one, and that budgeting rules are not in practice creating perverse incentives limiting cooperation between units. We are considering providing a special report to the Senate clarifying these important matters.

Among other items of business that the Committee now intends to take up in the spring term are the following:

3. Review of revenues and expenses for the College of Professional Studies and GW Solutions
4. Review of the Medical Center's Budget
5. Study of revenues and expenditures on Athletics and Recreation (a subcommittee joint with the Senate Athletics and Recreation Committee)
6. Jointly with Professional Ethics and Educational Policy Committees, we will review the proposal for a new "School of Public Policy & Public Affairs" within Columbian College.

Submitted for the Committee:


William B. Griffith, Chair

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
MEMORANDUM

To: Prof. Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Faculty Senate
Executive Committee

From: Prof. Gregory E. Maggs, Chair (2002-2003), Faculty
Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic
Freedom (PEAF)

Subject: Interim Report of the PEAF Committee (2002-2003)

Date: December 13, 2002

On behalf of the Faculty Senate PEAF Committee, I am pleased to submit this brief interim report regarding the Committee's activities during the current academic year. The PEAF Committee is considering three principal issues this year, but has not taken any final actions yet.

The first issue is whether the Faculty Code should be amended to create an alternative to traditional "removal for cause proceedings" for faculty members who are no longer fulfilling their mandated professional responsibilities but for reasons of disability are unwilling or unable to resign. We are studying this matter with the input of the University Counsel.

The second issue is whether the Graduate School of Education and Human Development is in compliance with the rules in the Faculty Code concerning the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty. We are waiting for additional information from the Administration. Last year, the PEAF committee proposed a resolution concerning the compliance with these rules by the School of Public Health and Health Services.

The third issue, recently forwarded to us by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, is whether the title of "Professor of Practice," currently used by the Elliot School of International Affairs should be listed in the Faculty Code.

We hope to reach a final conclusion on each of these issues by the end of the academic year. We also will address other issues as they arise.

PEAF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair: Gregory Maggs (gmaggs@law.gwu.edu)
Kurt Darr (hsmkjd@gwumc.edu)
Linda Gallo (llgallo@gwu.edu)
David Goodenough (goodenou@gwu.edu)
Robert Harrington (rharring@seas.gwu.edu)
Walter K. Kahn (wkkahn@seas.gwu.edu)
David Robinson (robby@main.nlc.gwu.edu)
Gary Simon (gsimon@mfa.gwu.edu)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

Craig Linebaugh (cline@gwu.edu)
Judy Solberg (judys@gwu.edu)
Richard Weitzner (richardw@gwu.edu)
Art Wilmarth (awilmarth@main.nlc.gwu.edu)
Michael Young (myoung@main.nlc.gwu.edu)

December 6, 2002

To: Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Executive Committee
George Washington University Faculty Senate

Fr: Joseph J. Cordes
Chair, Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs

Re: Interim Report

The Faculty Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs met twice in Fall semester 2002. The following items were taken up at these meetings.

- § Prof. Cordes reported to the Committee on the meeting of the Board of Trustees Committee on Urban and University Affairs.
- § The Committee will work to implement the resolution passed last year to encourage GW involvement in a Film Festival, starting with a partnership with an existing DC Film Festival. The partnership is anticipated to involve the following departments: Media and Public Affairs, Film Studies, and student organizations. The initiative is to be headed-up by Prof. Yvonne Captain of Romance Languages and Literatures.

The Committee has agreed to take up two agenda items for the Spring.

- § The Committee plans to explore the possibility of working with a local group (based at Georgetown) called Community Outreach, Research and Learning (CORRAL) to enhance opportunities for student service working with private voluntary organizations in the DC/Foggy Bottom area. Representatives of CORRAL will meet with the Committee at its January meeting.
- § The Committee will explore working with appropriate University offices to develop systematic programming for Kogan Plaza, both during the academic year and the Summer.

In addition, the Committee wished to go on record to express its appreciation to GWU student, Josh Singer, for organizing the two Farmer's Markets that have been held on Kogan Plaza. The Committee plans to draft a Faculty Senate resolution to formally thank Mr. Singer, and those who worked with him, for developing this highly successful event.

**Interim Report of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
to the Faculty Senate**

December 13, 2002

The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students has met three times during the fall semester. Our activity this year will focus on the following:

1. The consideration of a proposed amendment to the Student Academic Integrity Code from the administration.
2. Pursuant to the Code, review and evaluate the procedures in effect and evaluate how they are being applied and how well they are working in dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.
3. Review the appeals process and consider the appropriateness of maintaining copies of each appeal and new evidence with the Academic Vice President.

We have met with Tim Terpstra, Director of the Academic Integrity Office and are considering the best approach in conducting the evaluation(2). Activities 1 and 3 will be dealt with during the first two meetings of the spring semester. Discussions will also take place with Vice President Linebaugh and Assistant Vice President Donna Scarboro.

Co-Chairs

Fiona Conroy

Professor Sal Paratore

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
December 13, 2002

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- Senate Elections

The Deans have been asked to arrange for election of representatives to the Faculty Senate from their schools and to transmit the results by February 15 so that organization of the 2003-2004 session can be accomplished. The Faculty Code requires that elections be held prior to March 15th. The Executive Committee would appreciate your assistance in making certain that this matter is placed on the agenda for the next meeting of your school.

- Teaching Evaluation Task Force

The Executive Committee has forwarded the appointment of Professor Michael Sodaro for membership on the Teaching Evaluation Task Force. Professor Peter Rollberg has been appointed as the administration's representative by Vice President Lehman. Two faculty members and two students are still to be appointed. The latter will be selected on the recommendation of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students.

- Trimester Study Task Force

The three colleagues who will represent the faculty on this task force have been appointed by the Executive Committee. They are Professors Edward Cherian, Paul Churchill, and Carol Hoare.

SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom will be considering whether the faculty title, "Professor of Practice," should be added to the Faculty Code listing of faculty titles.

The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students is undertaking a review of the section of the Code of Academic Integrity that deals with the review process. This assignment was prompted by some of the concerns raised by Senate members during the discussion of the hearing and appeals process.

OTHER MATTERS

Academic Governance Restructuring

By now all Senate members will have received the correspondence between President Trachtenberg and the Executive Committee, beginning in September and ending with the President's letter of December 3rd.

In this last letter, President Trachtenberg has furnished us with further information regarding his proposed governance restructuring.

On the basis of this letter and previous correspondence, the Executive Committee's understanding is that the Vice President for Academic Affairs remains the chief academic officer and that all academic deans and their schools will continue to report to him. All academic matters, then, will continue to be directed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost will "have reporting to him two vice presidents," and, as the President indicated in his September 18th letter, the appointment is an interim one of "a fixed three-year term."

That is the Executive Committee's understanding regarding the main points of faculty concern with respect to this matter, although a number of our questions have not been specifically answered. It is our view that should changes to the academic leadership or academic reporting lines be contemplated in the future, in accordance with our system of shared governance as defined by the Faculty Code, these should come before the Faculty Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is on December 20th. Resolutions, reports, or other matters for the January 17th meeting should be sent to the Executive Committee prior to that date.

Please be reminded that the annual University Holiday Party is scheduled for December 17th at 2 - 4:30 in the Marvin Center, 3rd Floor. This is a wonderful occasion for sharing time with faculty, staff, and administration.

I would also like to extend happy birthday wishes to both Vice President Bond and Vice President Lehman; and as President Trachtenberg's birthday is tomorrow, wish him a happy birthday as well.

Finally, on behalf of the Executive Committee I extend very best wishes for a healthy, happy, and productive new year.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

December 2, 2002

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, December 13, 2002, at 2:10 p.m. in the Alumni House, First Floor, 1925 F Street, N.W.

AGENDA

- 1. Call to order**
- 2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of November 8, 2002, as distributed**
- 3. Introduction of Resolutions**
- 4. Update on University Advancement: Vice President Beverly Bond**
- 5. Update on the Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act;
Confidentiality of Student Records: Registrar Dennis L. Geyer**
- 6. General Business:**
 - (a) Report of the Executive Committee; Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**
 - (b) Interim Reports of Senate Committees**
- 7. Brief Statements (and Questions)**
- 8. Adjournment**

Dennis L. Geyer

Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

TO: Deans, Department Chairs, Administrators, Faculty and Staff
FROM: Dennis L. Geyer, University Registrar
DATE: November 1, 2002
SUBJECT: Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
Confidentiality of Student Academic Records - Annual Statement

HISTORY

The Family Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 ("Act"), as amended, seeks to guarantee both a student's right of access to records and the confidentiality of student information for anyone who has ever matriculated at an educational institution. Individuals who have been denied admission to the University are not covered by the Act.

There is nothing in the Act that is intended to restrict the use of student information by University officials in the normal exercise of their duties involving the educational interests of the student. With very limited exceptions, student information must not be transmitted by these officials to anyone outside the University without either express written release by the student or pursuant to a lawfully issued subpoena/order. Releases pursuant to subpoena or other legal mandate must be coordinated through the Office of the General Counsel.

Education records are defined as records directly related to the student and maintained by the University. This generally does not include records of the law enforcement unit, medical or similar professional records, and employment records. (Note: student employment records are considered to be education records by FERPA).

GUIDELINES FOR RELEASE OF STUDENT INFORMATION

Conditions for Student Access are:

- Presentation by the student of a picture Identification Card, or
- Receipt of a signed and dated request from the student.

Students must NOT be allowed access to:

- Education records that contain information on more than one student (the student may review only the specific information about himself or herself). Faculty: be especially aware that posting of grades, exam results by name and/or complete student id is not permitted. A variation of student id is allowed, for example, the last five digits of the student id or your own unique identifier that you assign to students for class purposes.
- Financial records of the student's parents.
- Letters of recommendation or reference received after January 1, 1975 for which the right of inspection has been waived.

DIRECTORY INFORMATION

The following is considered DIRECTORY INFORMATION and is available to the public UNLESS the student has formally requested that this information be held private/confidential.

Student's name, local address (including e-mail), telephone numbers, likenesses used in University publications including photographs, name and address of emergency contact, dates of attendance, school or division of enrollment, enrollment status, field of study, credit hours earned, degrees earned, honors received, participation in University recognized organizations and activities (including intercollegiate athletics), height, weight and age of members of athletic teams.

TO REQUEST NON-DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTORY INFORMATION

This designated directory information is subject to release by the University at any time unless the University (Office of the Registrar) received prior written objection from the student. Currently enrolled students may withhold disclosure of directory information by filing a request form with the Registrar's Office.

RELEASE OF EDUCATION RECORDS

The University is authorized to provide access to student records to campus officials and employees who have legitimate educational interest in such access, without the student's written consent. These persons are those who have responsibilities in connection with campus academic, administrative or service functions and who have reason for using student records connected with their campus or other related academic/administrative responsibilities as opposed to a personal or private interest. Such determination will be made on a case-by-case basis.

University officials will release educational information upon receipt of a signed, dated, written consent of the student which must specify the records that may be disclosed and identify the party to whom the disclosure may be made.

Parents of a dependent student, as defined by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Section 152, and who supply supporting documentation, may be granted access to a student's educational record under some circumstances.

Other circumstances that allow access to a student's educational record:

In connection with Financial Aid; to organizations who are conducting studies on behalf of educational agencies; to Federal or State educational authorities; to accrediting organizations; in compliance with a lawfully issued subpoena; in connection with a health or safety emergency.

Non-University individuals (including parents except as described above) may not have access to educational records other than Directory Information unless authorization from the student is obtained or a lawfully issued subpoena/court order is issued to the University.

Examples of data items NOT released: grades; grade point average; the specific number of hours/credits enrolled, passed or failed; **Social Security Number**; name of parents or next of kin. PLEASE NOTE: POSTING OF GRADES BY SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER IS A VIOLATION OF FERPA!

CONSEQUENCES OF VIOLATING THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT

Certain consequences are possible, if an individual is found in non-compliance with these rules and regulations, as defined by FERPA:

- Unsatisfactory performance appraisal for the employee, consistent with the personnel policies of the University;
- Accountability of the employee in a court of law (confidentiality and privacy requirements are regulated by Federal law);
- Possible loss to the University of available funds under Federal programs administered by the Secretary of Education.

Complaints of FERPA violation(s) may be filed by students with the Family Policy & Compliance Office, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202-4605.

Additional detailed information may be found in the 2002-2003 GW Planner and Handbook, as compiled by Student and Academic Support Services Communication and Technology on behalf of the Division of Student and Academic Support Services. The above are interpretative guidelines only. For clarification and further detail or any specific question you may have, please write to the University Registrar, Office of the Registrar, Rice Hall, 2121 Eye St. NW, Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20052

**PLEASE SHARE THIS MEMORANDUM WITH ALL PERSONS
WHO HAVE ACCESS TO OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT RECORDS**